



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/722,659	09/27/1996	D. CLARK BENNETT	104385.140	4359

7590

08/30/2002

HOLLIE L. BAKER
HALE & DORR LLP.
60 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

DECLoux, AMY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1644

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2002

42

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

08/722,659

Applicant(s)

BENNETT ET AL.

Examiner

Amy M. DeCloux

Art Unit

1644

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☒ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.


Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-7 and 18-19.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: Form 943 Draftsman's Review

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Affidavits submitted after final rejection are subject to the same treatment as amendments submitted after final rejection, see *In re Affidavit Filed After Final Rejection*, 152 USPQ 292 (Comm'r Pat. 1966). If amendments touching the merits of the application or patent under reexamination are presented after final rejection, or after appeal has been taken, or when such amendment might not otherwise be proper, they may be admitted upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and were not earlier presented, see MPEP 714.12 and 37 CFR 1.116. It is noted that a 102(e) or (f) rejection anticipated by US Patent No. 5,997,863 was not addressed by applicant in Applicant's reply filed 3-18-02 (Paper No. 37), and thus said rejection was maintained in the Final rejection mailed 5/31/02 (Paper No.38). Applicant is now traversing said 102(e) or (f) rejection in Applicant's instant after-final response and declaration also filed after final. Since there is no showing why said response and declaration could not have been made earlier, they have not been fully considered. Applicant contends that said declaration overcomes said 102 (e) or (f) rejection because two of the inventors on the referenced patent have been eliminated, leaving the inventorship of the interested subject matter to three remaining inventors, all of which are listed as inventors on the instant application, and subsequently concluding that the referenced patent was not done by another. However, it is noted that the inventive entity on the instant application also includes inventors that were not listed on the referenced patent and therefore, the referenced patent was done by "another". The rejection is maintained, essentially for the reasons of record.


PATRICK J. NOLAN, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER